United Nations A/62/666–S/2008/56

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
30 January 2008

Original: English

General Assembly
Sixty-second session
Agenda item 22
Question of Cyprus

Security Council
Sixty-third year

Letter dated 25 January 2008 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 25 January 2008, addressed to you by Kemal Gökeri, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex).

I should be grateful if the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 22, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Baki **İlkin**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

08-22172 (E) 010208

Annex to the letter dated 25 January 2008 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to refer to the statement made by the representative of the Greek Cypriot administration to the Third Committee on 31 October 2007 (see A/C.3/62/SR.33), under agenda item 70 (b), "Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms", which contains false allegations against the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. Since the Greek Cypriot side is habitually utilizing every opportunity to distort facts pertaining to the question of Cyprus in every international forum where the Turkish Cypriot side is denied lawful representation, I am compelled to respond, once again, in writing in order to put the record straight.

Throughout the many years following the Greek Cypriot destruction of the 1960 partnership Republic of Cyprus, the Greek Cypriot side has managed to misinform the international community and to portray the Cyprus problem as one of "invasion" and "occupation", while disguising the torment and unjust isolation inflicted on the Turkish Cypriot people. The restrictions imposed by the Greek Cypriot side violating the basic human rights of Turkish Cypriots in various fields, such as the rights to freely trade and travel, participate in worldwide sports, cultural events and educational schemes, such as the Bologna Process, are continuing and efforts to rectify this situation by various parties are still impeded by the Greek Cypriot side. A case in point is the incessant efforts of the Greek Cypriot administration directed towards Syria with the aim of halting the ferry services which have begun between the ports of Famagusta, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, and Latakia, Syria.

None of the United Nations resolutions to which reference is made in the above-mentioned statement describe the legitimate and justified Turkish intervention of 1974, undertaken in accordance with the Treaty of Guarantee of 1960, as "aggression" or "invasion", or the subsequent presence of Turkish troops on the island as "occupation". Such distortions are purely a Greek Cypriot invention aimed at blurring the issue and confusing the innocent with the guilty. On this point, I would only like to recall the dramatic statement made by Archbishop Makarios, the Greek Cypriot leader at the time, before the Security Council on 19 July 1974 (see S/PV.1780), in which he openly accused Greece, not Turkey, of invading and occupying Cyprus. His remarks, which came only four days after the Greek Cypriot coup of 15 July 1974, are well recorded in the annals of the United Nations and hardly require further elaboration.

The years from 1963 to 1974, which my Greek Cypriot colleague chooses not to mention, were a period in which the Greek Cypriots, aided and abetted by Greece, practised ethnic cleansing, terrorism and tyranny against the Turkish Cypriots, all in the name of enosis (annexation of the island to Greece). The atrocities committed by the Greek Cypriots during that period drew comments from the international news media, such as *The Washington Post*, which reported in its issue of 17 February 1964 that "Greek Cypriot fanatics appear bent on a policy of genocide"; from prominent statesmen like George Ball, the United States Under-Secretary of State at the time, who wrote in his memoirs, entitled *The Past Has Another Pattern* (p. 64), that "Makarios's central interest was to block off Turkish intervention so that he and his Greek Cypriots could go on happily massacring Turkish Cypriots"; and from the

United Nations Secretary-General himself, who, in his report to the Security Council of 10 September 1964, stated that the Turkish Cypriots were living under "veritable siege" (see S/5950, para. 222). The attempt by Greek Cypriot officials to brush aside the 11-year-long ordeal of the Turkish Cypriots is, to say the least, outrageous. It shows their total insincerity and refusal to show any sign of remorse or an attitude conducive to reconciliation.

As you would recall, the most recent effort, namely the Annan Plan, failed yet again as a result of the Greek Cypriot rejection. The Plan was submitted for the approval of the two sides through separate referendums on 24 April 2004. Despite the significant sacrifices it entailed for the Turkish Cypriot side, the Turkish Cypriot people approved the Plan by 65 per cent of the vote, whereas 76 per cent of the Greek Cypriot people overwhelmingly rejected the Plan in line with the call made by the Greek Cypriot leader, Tassos Papadopoulos, in a television address on 7 April 2004, where he demanded a "resounding no" from the Greek Cypriots.

The results of the referendums have shown which side is for a solution and which side is for the continuation of the present situation. The rejection by the Greek Cypriot side of the Plan, however, also resulted in an unjust situation. The Greek Cypriot side, which voted against a solution, joined the European Union on behalf of the whole of Cyprus, and the Turkish Cypriot side, which voted for a settlement, not only remained outside EU but continues to be subjected to isolation and restrictions. In fact, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in his report to the Security Council of 28 May 2004 (S/2004/437, para. 90), pointed to this injustice and declared that the Turkish Cypriot "*vote has undone whatever rationale might have existed for pressuring and isolating them*".

In spite of the fact that the Annan Plan provided the Greek Cypriot people with concrete advantages at the expense of the Turkish Cypriots, the Greek Cypriot administration, which chose to categorically reject the Plan, still has the audacity to complain about the so-called "violation of human rights concerning the property issue", the "Turkish military presence on the island" and other matters. In this regard the Secretary-General's observation is important:

> *"The rejection of such a plan by the Greek Cypriot electorate is a major setback. What was rejected was the solution itself rather than a mere blueprint. Benefits for the Greek Cypriots which have been sought for decades — including the reunification of Cyprus, the return of a large swathe of territory, the return of most displaced persons to their homes (including a majority, some 120,000, under Greek Cypriot administration), the withdrawal of all troops not permitted by international treaties, the halting of further Turkish immigration and (if Greek Cypriot figures are accurate) the return to Turkey of a number of 'settlers' — have been foregone."*
>
> (Secretary-General's report of 28 May 2004, S/2004/437, para. 83)

Contrary to the Greek Cypriot representative's allegations, the history of human rights violations in Cyprus goes back a long time. Parallel to that, the issue of "refugees" or displaced persons came about when one fourth of the Turkish Cypriot population was rendered homeless as from December 1963, when they had to flee for their lives as a result of the Greek Cypriot onslaught. It is true that many Turkish Cypriots as well as Greek Cypriots were displaced in 1974 as a result of the Greek coup d'état and its aftermath. It is equally true, however, that the question of

displaced persons was settled through the Voluntary Exchange of Populations Agreement reached between the two sides at the third round of talks, held at Vienna in 1975. The Agreement was implemented under the supervision of the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus.

With respect to the so-called "enclaves" in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, I wish to recall that the term "enclaved" was first used by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to describe the plight of the Turkish Cypriots between 1963 and 1974, who had been squeezed by the Greek Cypriots into small pockets scattered around the island. The total area of the Turkish Cypriot enclaves was a mere 3 per cent of the territory of the island. Since 1974, the Greek Cypriot side has attempted to hijack this term to misrepresent the living conditions of the Greek Cypriots and Maronites residing in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, for purely propaganda purposes.

One should note that the Greek Cypriots and Maronites enjoy the same, if not better, standard of living as the Turkish Cypriots of the same area. This has been confirmed in your predecessor's report of 10 June 1998 to the Security Council (S/1998/488, para. 22), wherein it is stated that "the standard of living of Greek Cypriots on the Karpas Peninsula does not differ significantly from that of Turkish Cypriots living in the same area".

One of the most fundamental issues in the Cyprus question is the property issue. The property issue in Cyprus did not come about in 1974 but first arose in 1963, when the Turkish Cypriots were forced to abandon their homes at gunpoint and took refuge in what came to be known "Turkish Cypriot Enclaves". It should be stressed that it is not only the Greek Cypriots who left immovable property in the North but also the Turkish Cypriots who had to abandon a considerable amount of property in the South as well, most of which was confiscated by the Greek Cypriot administration, leaving no possibility for restitution and/or compensation for the Turkish Cypriots for the use and enjoyment of their properties. Instead of seeking to resolve the issue with the Turkish Cypriot side in accordance with established parameters, the Greek Cypriot side has over the years encouraged recourse to the European Court of Human Rights in a bid to carry the issue to the European platform. As in the case of *Apostolides v. Orams* (para. 13), the Greek Cypriot side's unilateral accession to the European Union has presented it with the opportunity to further complicate the issue of property rights by encouraging recourse to courts in the South against those buying or selling property in the North. Given the fact that the Greek Cypriot side does not have jurisdiction over the Turkish Cypriot side, it is clear that judgements issued by the Greek Cypriot courts cannot be executed in the North.

In the absence of cooperation from the Greek Cypriot side, since June 2003 the Turkish Cypriot side has been taking unilateral steps aimed at providing domestic legal remedies to the concerned parties. In this connection, taking into account the admissibility decision of the European Court of Human Rights of 14 March 2005 and its judgement of 22 December 2005 on the merits of the *Xenides-Arestiis v. Turkey* application, the law entitled "Law for the Compensation, Exchange and Restitution of Immovable Properties (Law No. 67/2005)" was enacted in North Cyprus in December 2005. This law envisages compensation, exchange and restitution for movable and immovable properties located within the boundaries of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus which were possessed by the Greek

Cypriots before 1974 and were abandoned thereafter. In accordance with this legislation, the Immovable Property Commission was established on 22 March 2006, the mechanism of which is entirely based on the comprehensive guidelines suggested by the European Court of Human Rights. The Commission, which comprises seven members, two of whom are internationally renowned personalities of non-Turkish descent, has the status of a court and its decisions are binding and implemented just as the decisions of the judiciary.

It must be noted in this context that the reaction of the Greek Cypriot administration to the establishment of the Immovable Property Commission has not been encouraging; that administration has threatened to take legal action against potential applicants. Sadly, the Greek Cypriot authorities are attempting to undermine an effective legal instrument which conforms fully to relevant international norms. It is noteworthy in this regard that the very recent *Turkey 2007 Progress Report*, published by the Commission of the European Communities on 6 November 2007 (SEC(2007) 1436, p. 25), notes the following:

> "In its follow-up decision of December 2006, the Court [ECHR] accepted, in principle, the Immovable Property Commission established by the Turkish Cypriot Community as a legitimate domestic remedy."

As to the well-known allegation of "destruction of cultural property", I would like to reiterate once again that the protection of cultural heritage is of great importance to the Turkish Cypriot people, and the Turkish Cypriot authorities are doing everything with their limited means for the restoration and preservation of the cultural wealth in the North. No doubt, much more could be done with international financial support. It is a sad irony that the Turkish Cypriot people are heavily criticized for not taking sufficient care of the cultural heritage in the North, when international organizations or private bodies entrusted for the financial assistance in this field have been prevented by the Greek Cypriot administration from taking an interest in or providing assistance to the North. The protection of cultural heritage should not be held hostage by the political situation on the island, for which Turkish Cypriots cannot be held responsible. Furthermore, it should be recalled that there are many Turkish-Muslim cultural monuments, including mosques, baths, fountains and cemeteries, in the Greek Cypriot side that are in very bad condition owing to rough handling, negligence and wilful destruction.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate the Turkish Cypriot side's firm commitment to the comprehensive settlement of the Cyprus problem under the auspices of your good offices mission and on the basis of the United Nations Settlement Plan.

I should be grateful if the present letter could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 22, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) M. Kemal **Gökeri**
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus